Public Works (1910) Department.

G.O., No. 1743

DATED 7/6/1910.

7 P

The Notes
in this G.O. have been printed.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Masonry Sluice at 7 miles of the Periyar Main Canal, Madura Dt

An estimate, amounting to Rs. 1,750, for reconstructing the —, sanctioned with remarks

F.E.O./Dr/Inc 11/6 Indexed.

Registered as No 24-I of 1910-11

8.6.10.

[P. W. 2. 1,250—22-7-09.]

May 8/6/10

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Recd.	1910.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 174 I., 7th June 1910.

Masonry sluice at 7 miles of the Periyar Main Canal, Madura District

An estimate, amounting to Rs. 1,750, for reconstructing the —, sanctioned with remarks.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

Read—the following papers :—

I

Letter—from T. W. S. Smyth, Esq., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
To—the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Dated—Trichinopoly, the 29th March 1910.
No.—366 C.E.

I have the honour to forward herewith, for your approval and sanction of Government, an estimate for reconstructing the sluice in ruins (in the Natchikulam tank through which the Periyár Main canal passes) at 7 miles, Periyár Main canal. The old sluice appears to have been constructed prior to the advent of Periyár and the estimate is recommended for sanction against the Revenue account of the system, as by sanctioning the same under 49. Irrigation, the capital cost of the Periyár system is unnecessarily saddled without any increase in revenue.

2. The work will be completed before the end of 31st March 1911.

Enclosure.

Report to accompany the estimate for reconstructing the masonry sluice at 7/0 mile in the right bank of Periyár Main canal.

	RS.
Amount of estimate	1,750

The existing sluice at 7/0 mile of Periyár Main canal is in very bad order, the front head and wings having collapsed, and the barrel is choked up and beyond repairs.

There is a cart-track in rear going parallel to the bund for which provision has to be made.

It is proposed to rebuild a sluice as per plan accompanying about 10 feet above the site of the existing sluice and to block up the existing sluice completely.

The ayacut under the sluice is 394 acres and with a duty of 60 the discharge required will be 6·56 cusecs.

The ventway has been designed with reference to paragraph 12 of the Chief Engineer's Circular Memorandum No. 3023, dated 4th April 1907.

The cost of the existing work is not known, nor can any information as to when it was built be had from the list of works sanctioned for Periyár Project embodied in G.O., No. 863 I., dated 8th September 1908.

However as the work pertains to working expenses, it may be classed under 42. Major Works charged to Revenue.

Data for principal items are enclosed.

Early sanction to the estimate is requested so that the work may be completed during the closure.

18th March 1910.

J. M. M. Parker,
Executive Engineer, Madura Division.

II

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, dated 6th April 1910, R.O.C. No. 1340/10

III

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 18th May 1910.

The Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, submits, an estimate, amounting to Rs. 1,750, for reconstructing the sluice at 7/0 mile of Periyár Main canal, having an ayacut of 394 acres. It is stated that the existing sluice is beyond repairs as the front head and wings have collapsed and the barrel is choked up completely. It is therefore proposed to rebuild the sluice about 10 feet above the site of the existing one and to block up the latter completely.

2. The estimate is recommended for sanction under the Revenue account of the Periyár system, the approximate cost of the old work being taken at Rs. 1,000.

3. Considering the small acreage under the sluice, the design submitted appears to be unnecessarily elaborate and expensive and the Superintending Engineer should consider, before execution, whether a less expensive design will not meet the case.

C. A. SMITH,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Order—No. 174 I., dated 7th June 1910.

The recommendation of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation is approved and the following estimate sanctioned :—

Divided Head.
42. Major Works (Working Expenses).
Periyár System.
I. Extensions and Improvements.
2. Main Canals and Branches.
D. Regulators.
Reconstructing the masonry sluice at 7 miles of Periyár Main canal.

	RS.
Estimate	1,750

2. This sanction is registered as No. 24 I. of 1910–11.

3. The attention of the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, is drawn to paragraph 3 of the note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

(True Extract.)

C. A. SMITH,
Joint Secretary to Govt., P. W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, with plans and estimate.
,, Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Forwarded to the

(By Order.)

Deputy Registrar.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 174 I., DATED 7TH JUNE 1910.

[SUBJECT.—*Estimate amounting to Rs.* 1,750 *for reconstructing the masonry sluice at* 7 *miles of the Periyár Main canal.*]

From the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, dated 29*th March* 1910, *No.* 366-*C.E.*

Under Secretary—

As the old sluice was constructed prior to the advent of the Periyár project and no increase in revenue is expected from the work, it is proposed to charge the expenditure to the Revenue account of the project. The estimate requires the sanction of Government with reference to G.O., No. 404 I., dated 5th May 1899.

2. For orders whether the estimate may be checked for sanction.

B.G.R.
2–4–10.

The question whether the cost of the work should be charged to "Capital" or "Revenue" is governed by Code paragraph 1921 as this is a case of replacement. To decide this question, an estimate of the cost of the existing work is necessary. As the Superintending Engineer has not furnished this information, a draft reference to him is put up The estimate may be checked for sanction, before a reply is received from the Superintending Engineer.

S.S.
5–4–10.

Issue memorandum and estimate can go to Technical Section for check.

J. M. LACEY.
5–4–10.

[Issued as R.O.C. No. 1340, dated 6th April 1910.]

The estimate has been checked. The rates fairly agree with the schedule of the division. It is stated in the report accompanying the estimate that the ventway of sluice has been designed with reference to paragraph 12 of the Chief Engineer's Circular Memorandum No. 1323, dated 4th April 1907. The portion referred to is presumably that relating to the maximum capacity of channel which is to be 1·30 times the average capacity. If the duty at maximum capacity is 60 as noted in the plan of sluice, then the duty at average capacity is 1·3 × 60 = 78. For orders.

N.S.
22–4–10.

Under Secretary—

We must get out a revised circular as soon as possible and cancel the 1·30 factor.

C. A. SMITH.
1–5–10.

Since issued.

J. M. LACEY.
18–5–10.

Joint Secretary.

This was maximum capacity duty.

C.A.S.
1–5–10.

C.A.S.
2–5–10.

In another file the average duty for the Periyár canal worked out to about 80, I think. If the maximum capacity duty is taken as 70, the difference will be only 1 cusec and as the sluice is under regulation the estimate may be passed.

J.M.L.
28–4–10.

We must know the approximate value of the old sluice before we can deal with the estimate under Code paragraph 1971. I think, however, that we shall not be far wrong in assuming the original cost of old sluice at Rs. 1,000.

Draft order sanctioning estimate accordingly under the Revenue account. Considering the small acreage, the design of the sluice appears to be unnecessarily elaborate and expensive. Suggest in the Chief Engineer's note that the Superintending Engineer should consider before execution whether a less expensive design will not meet the case.

C. A. Smith.
2–5–10.

Under Secretary—

A draft order sanctioning the estimate is submitted for approval.

T.S.R.
12–5–10.

M.A.
12–5–10.

Joint Secretary.

J.M.L.
18–5–10.

C.A.S.
18–5-10.

[Issued as G.O., No. 174 I., dated 7th June 1910.]

2,000—20-4-09.

P.W.D. Irrigation Branch.

Subject :—

CURRENT FILE.

14

8

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

Ref. on Cur. No. 1340/10
dy 6.4.10

DESPATCHED
7 APR 1910

Memo

1) With reference to letter No. 366 C.E. dated 29th Mar 1910 from the S.E. VIth Circle forwarding for sanction an estimate for reconstruct a sluice at 7 miles, Periya Main Canal, the C.E. has the honor to request the S.E. to intimate, at an early date, ~~whether~~ the approximate original cost of the existing sluice. This information is required to enable this office to decide whether the estimate should be classed under the Revenue or the Open Capital, account of the Periya system - vide para 1921 of the P.W.D. Code

5-4-10

15 a

2). As the tank receives a continuous supply of Periyar water, the reason for allowing such a low duty of 60 is not ~~given~~ apparent and the S.E. is requested to give reasons for the same

[signature]
6.4.60

1/ 3P

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

The S. E VI circle submits an Estimate amounting to Rs 1750/- for reconstructing the sluice @ 7/0 mile of Periyar main Canal, having an ayacut of 394 acres. It is stated that (the) existing sluice is beyond repairs as the front head and wings have collapsed and the barrel is choked up completely. It is therefore proposed to rebuild the sluice about 10ft above the site of the existing one and to block up the latter completely.

2 The Estimate is recommended for sanction // under the Revenue Acct. of the Periyar System, the approximate cost of the old work being taken at Rs 1000.

3 Considering the small acreage under the sluice the design submitted appears to be unnecessarily elaborate and expensive and the S.E

vide E I's remarks on p 3 of N.f.

4

2/

4P

should consider, before execution, whether a less expensive design will not meet the case

~~4. The Supg Engr should Expedite the submission of the information called for in Memo ROC No 1340 dt 6.4.10 of the Chief Engr for Insp~~

MS
6.5.10

Not necessary
we have assumed
value as lower

PP 14 & 15 of C.f.

+

[signature]
18/5/10

[signature]
18/5

DEI

EI

[initials]
12.5.10

5

C № 1340 of '10

5147

CURRENT No. BY. PASSED ON BY. R. C. U. H. R. K. D. O.

25.5.10

SUBJECT :— Estimate of Rs 1750 for reconstructing the sluice at 7 miles of the Periyar Main Canal

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH.

Encs 4+2 plans 26

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Print — From the Supg. Engr: VI Circle, d/ 29. 3.10, № 366.C.E.

Quote — To — do — , d/ 6.4.10, R.O.C. № 1340/10

Print — Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, d/ 18.5.10

SP

—

Print Report

Print notes also

attached to this draft order.

Order. № 174 I d/ 7-6-10.

The recommendation of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation is approved and the following estimate sanctioned :—

Divided Head.

42. Major Works (Working Expenses)

Periyar System.

I. Extensions and Improvements.

2. Main Canals and Branches

D. Regulators.

Reconstructing the masonry sluice at 7 miles of Periyar Main Canal.

2

2

OP

Estimate Rs 1750.

2. This sanction is registered as No 26-I of 1910-11.

3. The attention of the Supdg Engr:, VI Circle, is drawn to paras 3-4 of the note by the Chief Engineer for Irrign.

attached to this draft order.

Issue.

18/5/10

18/5

12.5.10

To
The Chief Engineer for Irrign
" Supdg Engr:, VI Circle, with plans & est.
" Examr:, PW Accts

Despd 18/7/10

Despd 9/6/10

Ordinary Press

Exd 26-5-10

3